

The Sun

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1896.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their names returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Press and New York Association Press is at 31 to 33 Nassau street, all communications for the press of the whole country.

New York.

With the passage of the Greater New York bill the doubts of its wisdom which attended it while in the Legislature can come to an end, like the open appetites with which it was opposed. Don't worry over what is settled. The New York metropolis will appear officially on the maps for what it is, the second city in point of population in the civilized world.

It remains to devise a form of government which shall be worthy of New York as it is to be. When that is obtained, and we have no doubt that it will be obtained eventually, we are confident that the public directly concerned will look upon it with substantial unanimity as a great and beneficial achievement.

Here's to New York!

Men for the Navy.

Secretary HERBERT gives the best possible reasons for making the 1,000 additional men provided for in the Navy bill available as soon as it becomes law, instead of waiting for July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year. The three battle ships, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Texas, will be ready for crews by June 1, and their complements of enlisted men also, if we have the correct figures, are 424, 424, and 409, respectively. The existing supply of men is nearly or quite exhausted, and at all events, it is safe to say that the 1,000 additional will all be required for these ships alone. Besides, the spring is considered a much better time for getting men than the summer, as last year's experience showed. The bill should therefore be amended to conform with the Secretary's wish.

Great Britain's increase in officers and men within the last four years has been 17,860; that of France, 3,615; of Germany, 4,357; of Italy, 3,821. Germany's naval strength in ships may very well be compared with ours, but her personnel, including officers and men, is 21,487, while ours, including marines, is only 13,440. It is true that she has a conscription system in vogue, which allows a steady supply of men, but her army duty, and hence has more men available for the former; but she assigns to her navy as many of the conscripts as are needed, whereas we are compelled to calculate on having enough only for those in actual service, and sometimes put vessels out of commission in order to get their crews for new ones that must be tried.

This fact is at the basis of the proposal to authorize the Navy Department to enlist, in case of exigency, the naval militia and other volunteers for use on the reserve ships, and also on the auxiliary cruisers. And this, too, is the basis of the movement for organizing another body, to be called the Naval Reserve, composed of seafaring men and others whose occupations are connected with ships and their machinery.

But just now the additional men provided for in the pending bill will furnish great relief, and the House should consent to make this addition available at once.

Foreign Newspapers on Cuba.

Some interest has been taken recently in the Cuban question by a number of our contemporaries in European countries.

The leading papers of England have spoken of it most discreetly and cautiously, and if unwilling to offend the Americans by any utterance that might be disagreeable to us, and at the same time as if desirous of recognizing fully the claims of Spain upon Cuba. Our British contemporaries have their hands full with British affairs, foreign and domestic; and we have not seen in any one of them any important article upon the severe and sanguinary struggle between Spain and her colony in the West Indies.

Our French contemporaries are very nearly oblivious of the existence of the war in Cuba. French domestic politics and French foreign relations, the Egyptian and other African questions, are naturally regarded by them as of vastly greater and more immediate interest than a rebellion in a Spanish colony. In the Paris papers of the past few months we have frequently seen expressions of an unusually friendly sentiment toward Spain, and of a desire that she might speedily effect a settlement of her colonial troubles. Some references to Gen. Weyler's harsh policy toward the Cubans have been printed in Paris.

Our German contemporaries pay some attention to Cuban-American matters, and several of them speak thereupon in a manner that gives proof of their good judgment and impartiality. The Nord Deutscher Zeitung entertains the opinion that Weyler cannot fulfill his promise to suppress the Cuban rebellion, but at the same time, urges Spain to resist any interference from the United States, and to tell the Americans to mind their own business. The Vossische Zeitung believes that Spain may find it necessary to tolerate even the American recognition of Cuban belligerency, as she could not make war against the United States; but Spain, it says, would be justified in making a protest against such recognition. The Neue Nachrichten gives its judgment that the Madrid Cabinet ought to manifest the greatest prudence in dealing with the policy which the American Congress desires to enforce in the case of Cuba. The Berliner Post is apprehensive lest the Cuban war may yet be the cause of a crisis in the kingdom of Spain, and is desirous to the Spanish Government; and it is anxious for the sake of Spain, that good relations may yet be maintained between Washington and Madrid. We do not know that there has been any unreasonable utterance upon the subject of Cuba in any German paper.

We are interested in the language of those of our Russian contemporaries which have dealt with the Cuban question. The expressions of the Journal de St. Petersburg (official) are mainly explanatory, and are of very slight importance, but it holds that the American Government ought not to recognize the belligerent rights of the Cuban insurgents. The Novosti believes that the Americans favor the Cuban rebellion because they seek for an enlargement of their territory, and it dislikes, while we must say it misunderstands, the conduct of this Government toward Spain. Yet "Spain's cause is lost," says the Novosti, "for she is dealing, not with Cuba, but with America." The Novosti's opinion, which is not very well informed in the case, also disapproves of the American attitude to-

ward Spain, and says that American intervention between Spain and the Cuban insurgents is inadmissible, as it would be nothing less than external interference with the internal policy of the Spanish Government. The utterances of our Russian contemporaries are all the more deserving of consideration, in that they may be regarded as semi-official. They do not know of any one of them that has not a friendly disposition toward this country.

While our Spanish contemporaries of all parties uphold the flag of Spain in Cuba, it is pleasing to say that a number of them, in dealing with the subject, refrain from intemperate language.

In Europe at large the Cuban question is looked upon as inconsequential, excepting in so far as the United States may be concerned in it, or may, in some manner, become involved in it.

We recently noticed in an English publication, the Naval and Military Record, some observations relative to Spanish threats against this country, from which we take a few sentences:

"War between America and Spain could have but one result. It would be an energetic, not a passive, war against the proud but frivolous Spaniard. If the United States determine that Cuba shall be independent, the independence of Cuba is assured. If the United States determine that Cuba shall remain equal to the task of representing the revolutionary movement, we may be sure they would be quickly driven out of an army of the United States landed on the shores of the island. America has enough to prevent help from reaching the Spanish soldiers in Cuba. It would be well, therefore, for the Spanish Government to come to terms as speedily as possible with the American Government."

This is the opinion of the Naval and Military Record. It is the only opinion upon which our contemporaries in all the countries of Europe seem to be in agreement, so far as Cuba is concerned.

A Warning to "Administration" Candidates.

The Hon. BILLY RUSSELL of Massachusetts is in the field as an avowed aspirant for the Democratic nomination. For one good thing, he stands on a sound money platform that is absolutely solid and square. It is a healthy ambition that makes any newcomer, young or old, enter this year's race. The Hon. BILLY is fair, but neither fat nor forty; yet we believe that the young man ought to have a chance.

There is already an attempt, more or less successful, to create in the public mind the impression that Mr. RUSSELL of Massachusetts is the peculiar and deliberately chosen favorite of the CLEVELAND Administration. The Massachusetts platform, nonsectarian in some parts, disavowed altogether in others, is a political document anywhere except in its gold plank, seems to have been framed with a special view to encouraging this idea. Taken in connection with other circumstances attending Mr. RUSSELL's sudden leap on to the track, it is apparently designed to persuade people that the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND, having renounced third-term ambition, and perhaps having consulted with WHITNEY, DAN LAMONT, and a few choice spirits, has pitched upon the ex-Mayor of Cambridge as the preferred recipient of such help as the prestige of the White House and the favor of Federal patronage can render in the contest preliminary to Chicago.

A little while ago it was poor CARLISLE. Then it was OLNEY, to the joy of GEORGE FRED WILLIAMS and the anti-BILLY faction in the Bay State.

Now it is BILLY himself. To all of these gentlemen and to all others who may now or at any future time felicitate themselves upon the sunshine of Administrative favor, or nurse illusive expectations founded upon the supposed friendliness of the White House, we give notice that until the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND has published a letter distinctly declaring that he is opposed to third terms on principle, and that under no circumstances would he consent to run as a candidate for a third term, the pretended support of the Administration counts for nothing.

A little while ago it was poor CARLISLE. Then it was OLNEY, to the joy of GEORGE FRED WILLIAMS and the anti-BILLY faction in the Bay State. Now it is BILLY himself. To all of these gentlemen and to all others who may now or at any future time felicitate themselves upon the sunshine of Administrative favor, or nurse illusive expectations founded upon the supposed friendliness of the White House, we give notice that until the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND has published a letter distinctly declaring that he is opposed to third terms on principle, and that under no circumstances would he consent to run as a candidate for a third term, the pretended support of the Administration counts for nothing.

Now it is BILLY himself. To all of these gentlemen and to all others who may now or at any future time felicitate themselves upon the sunshine of Administrative favor, or nurse illusive expectations founded upon the supposed friendliness of the White House, we give notice that until the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND has published a letter distinctly declaring that he is opposed to third terms on principle, and that under no circumstances would he consent to run as a candidate for a third term, the pretended support of the Administration counts for nothing.

He Shall Not Go!

No lover of what is good, great, prominent, promising, philanthropic, and polished can deny the existence of a moist tendency upon the part of his lacrymal ducts when he reads that the Hon. ELIJAH ADAMS MORSE, a distant relative of the ADAMS family, and the present industries and syrup-lipped representative of the Twenty-third Massachusetts district, in the Fifty-fourth Congress, is he won't go there any more. The news is especially saddening at a time when the mail bags are once more full of Government seeds. To be sure, Mr. MORSE will disseminate his full quota this fall, and he may be the medium of securing for Puddle Dock and Ken Farms and the rest of his severely agricultural district the quotas of Congressmen from more urban regions. But what is agriculture in the Shell-I-Got-Naked district to do after March 4, 1897, if the chief hope and sales goes out of business? The prospect is gloomy, and the ruralists in the Old Colony Club are already saying the hayseed innote in their luxurious lodges. In fact, no prudent tiller of the soil in the Plymouth Plantations will dare to eat anything stronger than navy plug until he hears that the Hon. ELIJAH ADAMS MORSE, a distant relative of the ADAMS family, has receded himself, and has patriotically consented to become once more the genius of agriculture and the spendthrift of Government tomato seeds.

Our esteemed contemporary, the Boston Journal, a newspaper immutably near to the business and bosom of Mr. MORSE, is contented within the bounds of the truest truth when it says that he "is in receipt of a large number of letters and telegrams—many of them marked 'Paid'—expressing regret at his proposed retirement from public life." "A large number" is too cold a phrase. Would the Boston Journal call the sands on the seashore, or the wheels in a Populist's head, or the mathematical calculations of the Hon. CHARLES HENRY GROSVENOR of Ohio, demonstrating beyond the necessity of demonstration that the Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY has, must have, and

always will have a majority of the delegates to the St. Louis Convention, "a large number"? He just and fear not. No men in the United States who can write, and many of Mr. MORSE's A. P. A. admirers who can't, have failed to assure him of their resolve that he shall continue to be useful and as prebent in public life as he has been for many a happy year.

The Hon. ELIJAH ADAMS MORSE, M. C., a distant relative of the ADAMS family, is "a great reader," and it is natural that he should be willing to give his days and nights to the task of perusing certificates, recommendations, congratulations, and remonstrances which he is now receiving in mountains from all Massachusetts. But he is a little surprised. Has he had any intention of getting out of public life? Is he not willing to serve his country still? "They say ELIJAH MORSE doesn't want to come back to Congress," said the Hon. JOSEPH HENRY WALKER to the Hon. THOMAS BRACKETT HAZEN, "Humph!" answered the latter, "that is, the President that may be. I rather guess, JOE, it'll be a case of re-Morse!"

As Mr. MORSE has always been anxious to shame the Lord of Lies, let the truth be told. He comes from Canton, Mass. The Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY comes from Canton, O. "Mr. MCKINLEY is a fine-appearing man," observes Mr. MORSE, "but if the country wants a real old Canton statesman—" And the Canton Cornet Band plays "Hail to the Chief!"

Mr. MORSE is a tolerant and frequent thinker, and therefore beloved of the tolerant, frequent, quiet, and learned organization called the A. P. A., a powerful concern in Massachusetts, that home of liberty. Would he be bringing from public life Mr. MORSE should listen to the voices of these tolerant and frequent thinkers and be induced to become the next Republican candidate for Governor of Massachusetts? And if the tolerant and quiet and liberal thinkers should be thrown down with a whack which would make Ann and Cod noses, would not the millions of telegrams and letters make Mr. MORSE reconsider and consent to go back to Congress?

The Constitutional Crisis in France.

The Opportunists, who preponderate in the French Senate and hold that a Ministry is as much accountable to that body as it is to the Chamber of Deputies, have at last mustered courage enough to act upon their convictions, and have undertaken to drive Premier BOURGEOIS from office by the simple process of withholding supplies. By a vote of 171 to 90 they refused on Tuesday to make the appropriation needed to maintain the French troops in Madagascar until a Ministry should be appointed which would command the Senate's confidence. Thus driven to the wall, M. BOURGEOIS could do nothing but resign. No successor has yet been named, nor will one be until the Chamber of Deputies, which has been summoned to meet to-day, has shown how it regards the pretensions of the Senate to coordinate authority.

Obviously, it is no ordinary Ministerial crisis, but a constitutional crisis likely to have far-reaching consequences which the action of the Senate has provoked. Should the Chamber of Deputies assert that in the circumstances it was the duty of M. BOURGEOIS to resign, and should it proceed to vote confidence in a Ministry known to be acceptable to the Senate, the crisis would only be postponed, for although the explicit provisions of the present French Constitution would thus be declared binding in theory, they would prove in the future, as they have proved in the past, unworkable in practice. No man can serve two masters, and no Ministry can long remain responsible to two Chambers, the composition of which may be, and usually is, quite different. In the popular language of the French Legislature the radicals have for some time had a majority, but they form only a weak minority in the Senate; nor in this respect is their position likely to be improved speedily. But although the opponents of M. BOURGEOIS in the Chamber would gladly see him overthrown, they have probably too much esprit de corps to cooperate with the Senate at this juncture. Consequently, what we may expect to see is a deadlock in the French legislative machinery, the Senators maintaining that it shall be accountable to their Chamber only.

In this contest the Senate undoubtedly has on its side the text of the organic law, but the Chamber of Deputies can appeal to custom and to common sense. The Constitution of 1875, unquestionably does not require that Ministers shall be accountable to both branches of the legislature; and this dual responsibility is not the outcome of accident or ambiguity, but was deliberately contrived by the Monarchists who dominated the Versailles assembly. They took precautions, which they hoped would prove effective, to give themselves unshakable ascendancy in the Senate, so that if they should ever lose control of the Chamber of Deputies they might throw the whole machinery of republican government out of gear. The plan failed, however, because by the time GAMBETTA and his friends were able to force Marshal MACMURDO to resign the Presidency, the Monarchists in the Senate had become too weak to play the obstructive role which they had arranged for from that date, until the recent sharp collision caused by the method of investigating the Southern Railway scandal, any serious friction between the two Chambers was averted, either by compromise, or by eventual submission on the Senate's part, or by a show of deference to its wishes through the inclusion of influential Senators in a Ministry.

Until Tuesday of this week it was generally supposed that the Senate had once more submitted to be thrust aside, and that thus its claim of coordinate authority had been definitely renounced. For, when M. BOURGEOIS declined to resign, notwithstanding the vote of want of confidence which was passed some weeks ago, the Senate refrained from proclaiming an intention of refusing to vote appropriations.

It is evident that, in one way or another, the money needed by the Ministry to maintain the French troops in Madagascar must be got; but when we come to the question of method we must recognize that the Senate, under the Constitution devised by the Monarchists in 1875, occupies a very strong position. Undoubtedly, M. BOURGEOIS would like to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the constituencies on the issue whether Ministers should not be solely accountable to the people's direct representatives. Should such an appeal be successful, the demand for a revision of the Constitution on lines adverse to the Senate's pretensions could no longer be withstood. But President FALLOUX cannot dissolve Parliament and order a new election without the consent of the Senate. Nor can the two Chambers be convoked in joint assembly at Versailles for the purpose of revising the Constitution unless such a step has been

sanctioned by each Chamber voting separately. At the present conjuncture the Senate would probably decline to take part in a congress for revision on the ground that there was no popular demand for such a change.

For the moment the legislative machinery of France has been brought to a standstill, and students of constitutional law will watch with interest the measures taken to set it again in motion. One thing is evident, that sooner or later, and in practice if not in theory, the French Constitution must be changed. The Presidential type of Government is workable because under it the Ministers are responsible to the head of the State alone. A parliamentary type is workable because under it the Ministers are responsible only to the popular branch of the legislature. But the scheme framed for France in 1875 is not permanently workable, because under it the Ministers are made accountable to two Chambers, which may be very differently constituted and antagonistic to each other.

The Burden Jewels.

The circumstances of the robbery of the BURDEN jewels last December indicated very plainly that it must have been committed by persons familiar with the house and the habits of the household; and therefore the arrest of three of the servants of Mr. BURDEN is a not unexpected consequence of the long hunt after the thieves.

Mrs. BURDEN seems to have been unusually careless about her jewels, and, of course, such negligence is one of the most common causes of loss. Her servants, however, who know Mr. DOUGLAS's reputation for political independence and impartiality, would not believe that he ever made the assertion ascribed to him. Statesmen of his rank do not go off at half cock.

It is profoundly interesting if, and it may be true that, the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS says that "the anti-third-term idea is a sentimental piece of nonsense." The Memphis Appeal somewhat rashly and with an unnecessary amount of satire, confers the remarks attributed to the Hon. HANK DOUGLAS, however, who knows Mr. DOUGLAS's reputation for political independence and impartiality, would not believe that he ever made the assertion ascribed to him. Statesmen of his rank do not go off at half cock.

Your Uncle THOMAS COLLIER P. is a boss boss. We doubt if there has ever been the best of him in the Empire State, a community untroubled by political independence and impartiality in the Union.

Back in war times, the people willing to sacrifice the triumph of the Union cause in order to stop the war and make peace were known as Copperheads. Their spirit is now manifested in the highly moral efforts to establish a permanent Board of Arbitration between England and America, and especially on the land perils in flaunting a case of war in the face of the United States.

The Pulpit Fraud. To the Editor of THE SUN:—There is no telling how far the laws of expediency and the grim duty of "suffering fools gladly" is going to dominate the civil and religious judgment of New York. I beg only to offer most respectful congratulations to THE SUN on the undimmed lustre of its shining in the matter of the late England and America, and especially on the more patriotic defenses.

For Cuba in Earnest. To the Editor of THE SUN:—The action of the Congress of the United States in passing these Cuban resolutions must be very gratifying to any true patriot of the United States, and a great deal of credit should be given to the Senators and Representatives who voted for the resolutions, also the newspapers throughout the country who advocated freedom for Cuba.

Mr. BURDEN's experience with his servants was extraordinary, but their temptations to dishonesty seem to have been much more than usually great.

Goff. The formal phrase "learned Judge" which courtesy required the members of the Court of Appeals to apply to Recorder JOHN W. GOFF in their judgment reversing the conviction of MARIA BARRETT, invests the just severity of the language of the opinion with bitter irony. Rarely, if ever, has the highest appellate tribunal of our State held in review a case where the acts of the trial judge disclosed such ignorance of law and bias in the magistrate who conducted it.

The circumstances of the case of MARIA BARRETT indicated a lack of the premeditation necessary to the crime of murder in the first degree. Instead of withholding this grade of the offence from the consideration of the jury or of defining the different degrees that the jury would be guided to a correct conclusion, GOFF virtually directed a verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree. Moreover, he argued the case against the woman throughout the trial and displayed vindictiveness and vicious delight in the operation. In passing sentence he kept the sick prisoner standing before him for half an hour while he made a noisy speech, adorned with hideous gestures and grimaces, telling the poor creature how richly she deserved death and how useless would be an attempt to avoid it. The detailed account of his sneers and bullying, and his disregard of facts and law, is a disgraceful story which no citizen proud of New York can longer. Reversals of judgments because of differing opinions as to law points are common, and no judge feels aggrieved when his brother judges do not take his view. But the action of the Court of Appeals regarding GOFF is not merely a reversal, but a condemnation. It constitutes the most serious reflection, short of an accusation of actual corruption, that could be made upon his character as a magistrate; and it puts out of his reach forever the performance of any other deed so appropriate as would be the resignation of his office.

Here the irony of the situation is clear. The idea of GOFF resigning! He is loftily looking down at this moment on the Court of Appeals and pitying it, and thinking how the people will wonder at some day for not recognizing his greatness.

It is evident that, in one way or another, the money needed by the Ministry to maintain the French troops in Madagascar must be got; but when we come to the question of method we must recognize that the Senate, under the Constitution devised by the Monarchists in 1875, occupies a very strong position. Undoubtedly, M. BOURGEOIS would like to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the constituencies on the issue whether Ministers should not be solely accountable to the people's direct representatives. Should such an appeal be successful, the demand for a revision of the Constitution on lines adverse to the Senate's pretensions could no longer be withstood. But President FALLOUX cannot dissolve Parliament and order a new election without the consent of the Senate. Nor can the two Chambers be convoked in joint assembly at Versailles for the purpose of revising the Constitution unless such a step has been

sanctioned by each Chamber voting separately. At the present conjuncture the Senate would probably decline to take part in a congress for revision on the ground that there was no popular demand for such a change.

For the moment the legislative machinery of France has been brought to a standstill, and students of constitutional law will watch with interest the measures taken to set it again in motion. One thing is evident, that sooner or later, and in practice if not in theory, the French Constitution must be changed. The Presidential type of Government is workable because under it the Ministers are responsible to the head of the State alone. A parliamentary type is workable because under it the Ministers are responsible only to the popular branch of the legislature. But the scheme framed for France in 1875 is not permanently workable, because under it the Ministers are made accountable to two Chambers, which may be very differently constituted and antagonistic to each other.

The Burden Jewels. The circumstances of the robbery of the BURDEN jewels last December indicated very plainly that it must have been committed by persons familiar with the house and the habits of the household; and therefore the arrest of three of the servants of Mr. BURDEN is a not unexpected consequence of the long hunt after the thieves.

Mrs. BURDEN seems to have been unusually careless about her jewels, and, of course, such negligence is one of the most common causes of loss. Her servants, however, who know Mr. DOUGLAS's reputation for political independence and impartiality, would not believe that he ever made the assertion ascribed to him. Statesmen of his rank do not go off at half cock.

Your Uncle THOMAS COLLIER P. is a boss boss. We doubt if there has ever been the best of him in the Empire State, a community untroubled by political independence and impartiality in the Union.

Back in war times, the people willing to sacrifice the triumph of the Union cause in order to stop the war and make peace were known as Copperheads. Their spirit is now manifested in the highly moral efforts to establish a permanent Board of Arbitration between England and America, and especially on the land perils in flaunting a case of war in the face of the United States.

The Pulpit Fraud. To the Editor of THE SUN:—There is no telling how far the laws of expediency and the grim duty of "suffering fools gladly" is going to dominate the civil and religious judgment of New York. I beg only to offer most respectful congratulations to THE SUN on the undimmed lustre of its shining in the matter of the late England and America, and especially on the more patriotic defenses.

For Cuba in Earnest. To the Editor of THE SUN:—The action of the Congress of the United States in passing these Cuban resolutions must be very gratifying to any true patriot of the United States, and a great deal of credit should be given to the Senators and Representatives who voted for the resolutions, also the newspapers throughout the country who advocated freedom for Cuba.

Mr. BURDEN's experience with his servants was extraordinary, but their temptations to dishonesty seem to have been much more than usually great.

It is profoundly interesting if, and it may be true that, the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS says that "the anti-third-term idea is a sentimental piece of nonsense." The Memphis Appeal somewhat rashly and with an unnecessary amount of satire, confers the remarks attributed to the Hon. HANK DOUGLAS, however, who knows Mr. DOUGLAS's reputation for political independence and impartiality, would not believe that he ever made the assertion ascribed to him. Statesmen of his rank do not go off at half cock.

Your Uncle THOMAS COLLIER P. is a boss boss. We doubt if there has ever been the best of him in the Empire State, a community untroubled by political independence and impartiality in the Union.

Back in war times, the people willing to sacrifice the triumph of the Union cause in order to stop the war and make peace were known as Copperheads. Their spirit is now manifested in the highly moral efforts to establish a permanent Board of Arbitration between England and America, and especially on the land perils in flaunting a case of war in the face of the United States.

The Pulpit Fraud. To the Editor of THE SUN:—There is no telling how far the laws of expediency and the grim duty of "suffering fools gladly" is going to dominate the civil and religious judgment of New York. I beg only to offer most respectful congratulations to THE SUN on the undimmed lustre of its shining in the matter of the late England and America, and especially on the more patriotic defenses.

For Cuba in Earnest. To the Editor of THE SUN:—The action of the Congress of the United States in passing these Cuban resolutions must be very gratifying to any true patriot of the United States, and a great deal of credit should be given to the Senators and Representatives who voted for the resolutions, also the newspapers throughout the country who advocated freedom for Cuba.

Mr. BURDEN's experience with his servants was extraordinary, but their temptations to dishonesty seem to have been much more than usually great.

Goff. The formal phrase "learned Judge" which courtesy required the members of the Court of Appeals to apply to Recorder JOHN W. GOFF in their judgment reversing the conviction of MARIA BARRETT, invests the just severity of the language of the opinion with bitter irony. Rarely, if ever, has the highest appellate tribunal of our State held in review a case where the acts of the trial judge disclosed such ignorance of law and bias in the magistrate who conducted it.

The circumstances of the case of MARIA BARRETT indicated a lack of the premeditation necessary to the crime of murder in the first degree. Instead of withholding this grade of the offence from the consideration of the jury or of defining the different degrees that the jury would be guided to a correct conclusion, GOFF virtually directed a verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree. Moreover, he argued the case against the woman throughout the trial and displayed vindictiveness and vicious delight in the operation. In passing sentence he kept the sick prisoner standing before him for half an hour while he made a noisy speech, adorned with hideous gestures and grimaces, telling the poor creature how richly she deserved death and how useless would be an attempt to avoid it. The detailed account of his sneers and bullying, and his disregard of facts and law, is a disgraceful story which no citizen proud of New York can longer. Reversals of judgments because of differing opinions as to law points are common, and no judge feels aggrieved when his brother judges do not take his view. But the action of the Court of Appeals regarding GOFF is not merely a reversal, but a condemnation. It constitutes the most serious reflection, short of an accusation of actual corruption, that could be made upon his character as a magistrate; and it puts out of his reach forever the performance of any other deed so appropriate as would be the resignation of his office.

Here the irony of the situation is clear. The idea of GOFF resigning! He is loftily looking down at this moment on the Court of Appeals and pitying it, and thinking how the people will wonder at some day for not recognizing his greatness.

It is evident that, in one way or another, the money needed by the Ministry to maintain the French troops in Madagascar must be got; but when we come to the question of method we must recognize that the Senate, under the Constitution devised by the Monarchists in 1875, occupies a very strong position. Undoubtedly, M. BOURGEOIS would like to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the constituencies on the issue whether Ministers should not be solely accountable to the people's direct representatives. Should such an appeal be successful, the demand for a revision of the Constitution on lines adverse to the Senate's pretensions could no longer be withstood. But President FALLOUX cannot dissolve Parliament and order a new election without the consent of the Senate. Nor can the two Chambers be convoked in joint assembly at Versailles for the purpose of revising the Constitution unless such a step has been

sanctioned by each Chamber voting separately. At the present conjuncture the Senate would probably decline to take part in a congress for revision on the ground that there was no popular demand for such a change.

For the moment the legislative machinery of France has been brought to a standstill, and students of constitutional law will watch with interest the measures taken to set it again in motion. One thing is evident, that sooner or later, and in practice if not in theory, the French Constitution must be changed. The Presidential type of Government is workable because under it the Ministers are responsible to the head of the State alone. A parliamentary type is workable because under it the Ministers are responsible only to the popular branch of the legislature. But the scheme framed for France in 1875 is not permanently workable, because under it the Ministers are made accountable to two Chambers, which may be very differently constituted and antagonistic to each other.

The Burden Jewels. The circumstances of the robbery of the BURDEN jewels last December indicated very plainly that it must have been committed by persons familiar with the house and the habits of the household; and therefore the arrest of three of the servants of Mr. BURDEN is a not unexpected consequence of the long hunt after the thieves.

Mrs. BURDEN seems to have been unusually careless about her jewels, and, of course, such negligence is one of the most common causes of loss. Her servants, however, who know Mr. DOUGLAS's reputation for political independence and impartiality, would not believe that he ever made the assertion ascribed to him. Statesmen of his rank do not go off at half cock.

Your Uncle THOMAS COLLIER P. is a boss boss. We doubt if there has ever been the best of him in the Empire State, a community untroubled by political independence and impartiality in the Union.

Back in war times, the people willing to sacrifice the triumph of the Union cause in order to stop the war and make peace were known as Copperheads. Their spirit is now manifested in the highly moral efforts to establish a permanent Board of Arbitration between England and America, and especially on the land perils in flaunting a case of war in the face of the United States.

The Pulpit Fraud. To the Editor of THE SUN:—There is no telling how far the laws of expediency and the grim duty of "suffering fools gladly" is going to dominate the civil and religious judgment of New York. I beg only to offer most respectful congratulations to THE SUN on the undimmed lustre of its shining in the matter of the late England and America, and especially on the more patriotic defenses.

For Cuba in Earnest. To the Editor of THE SUN:—The action of the Congress of the United States in passing these Cuban resolutions must be very gratifying to any true patriot of the United States, and a great deal of credit should be given to the Senators and Representatives who voted for the resolutions, also the newspapers throughout the country who advocated freedom for Cuba.

Mr. BURDEN's experience with his servants was extraordinary, but their temptations to dishonesty seem to have been much more than usually great.

Goff. The formal phrase "learned Judge" which courtesy required the members of the Court of Appeals to apply to Recorder JOHN W. GOFF in their judgment reversing the conviction of MARIA BARRETT, invests the just severity of the language of the opinion with bitter irony. Rarely, if ever, has the highest appellate tribunal of our State held in review a case where the acts of the trial judge disclosed such ignorance of law and bias in the magistrate who conducted it.

The circumstances of the case of MARIA BARRETT indicated a lack of the premeditation necessary to the crime of murder in the first degree. Instead of withholding this grade of the offence from the consideration of the jury or of defining the different degrees that the jury would be guided to a correct conclusion, GOFF virtually directed a verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree. Moreover, he argued the case against the woman throughout the trial and displayed vindictiveness and vicious delight in the operation. In passing sentence he kept the sick prisoner standing before him for half an hour while he made a noisy speech, adorned with hideous gestures and grimaces, telling the poor creature how richly she deserved death and how useless would be an attempt to avoid it. The detailed account of his sneers and bullying, and his disregard of facts and law, is a disgraceful story which no citizen proud of New York can longer. Reversals of judgments because of differing opinions as to law points are common, and no judge feels aggrieved when his brother judges do not take his view. But the action of the Court of Appeals regarding GOFF is not merely a reversal, but a condemnation. It constitutes the most serious reflection, short of an accusation of actual corruption, that could be made upon his character as a magistrate; and it puts out of his reach forever the performance of any other deed so appropriate as would be the resignation of his office.

Here the irony of the situation is clear. The idea of GOFF resigning! He is loftily looking down at this moment on the Court of Appeals and pitying it, and thinking how the people will wonder at some day for not recognizing his greatness.

It is evident that, in one way or another, the money needed by the Ministry to maintain the French troops in Madagascar must be got; but when we come to the question of method we must recognize that the Senate, under the Constitution devised by the Monarchists in 1875, occupies a very strong position. Undoubtedly, M. BOURGEOIS would like to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the constituencies on the issue whether Ministers should not be solely accountable to the people's direct representatives. Should such an appeal be successful, the demand for a revision of the Constitution on lines adverse to the Senate's pretensions could no longer be withstood. But President FALLOUX cannot dissolve Parliament and order a new election without the consent of the Senate. Nor can the two Chambers be convoked in joint assembly at Versailles for the purpose of revising the Constitution unless such a step has been

sanctioned by each Chamber voting separately. At the present conjuncture the Senate would probably decline to take part in a congress for revision on the ground that there was no popular demand for such a change.

For the moment the legislative machinery of France has been brought to a standstill, and students of constitutional law will watch with interest the measures taken to set it again in motion. One thing is evident, that sooner or later, and in practice if not in theory, the French Constitution must be changed. The Presidential type of Government is workable because under it the Ministers are responsible to the head of the State alone. A parliamentary type is workable because under it the Ministers are responsible only to the popular branch of the legislature. But the scheme framed for France in 1875 is not permanently workable, because under it the Ministers are made accountable to two Chambers, which may be very differently constituted and antagonistic to each other.

ALONE WITH HIS FIDDLE.